

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :
Plaintiff, :
 :
v. : No. 3:86CV252 (EBB)
 :
STATE OF CONNECTICUT, et al., :
Defendants :

ORDER

Before the Court is the Special Master's Report to the Court No. 59: Deletion of Several Court Requirements [Doc. No. 1323] ("Report"). Without objection from the parties, the Special Master recommends the deletion of the several Remedial Plan Court Requirements for the reasons stated in his report. The master's Report is ACCEPTED and APPROVED.

Over the past seven years, many provisions of the Remedial Plan have been deleted or amended by the Court on the master's recommendation. The Court and master have also consistently provided for incremental release from active judicial oversight of nearly all remaining obligations. The emphasis in this case has been on ensuring that the desired results of the 1987 Consent Decree and the 1998 post-contempt Remedial Plan have been achieved, that there is independent verification of compliance, and that there follows an orderly conclusion to active judicial oversight.¹ The Report presents proposed deletions which will

¹United States v. State of Connecticut, 931 F. Supp. 974, 983-4 (D. Conn. 1996) (contempt ruling; "STS' systemic flaws" noted; defendants' self-reports of compliance not accepted; "such 'compliance' was not

substantially reduce both Defendants' subjection to judicially-imposed obligations and their time in performance, documentation and review of these items.

For the reasons stated in the master's report, it is hereby ORDERED that the following Remedial Plan Court Requirements are DELETED:

Topic	Items Deleted
1. <u>RP 1 and CR 8.</u> <u>Abuse/neglect</u> <u>Investigations</u>	Response Protocol 1 is deleted.
2. <u>Behavior Services.</u>	The phrase "(sample of at least 15)" is deleted from Court Requirement 50.
3. <u>Systemic Review of</u> <u>Abuse/Neglect.</u>	Court Requirement 3.5 is deleted.
4. <u>Emergency Evacuation</u> <u>Plans, Fire Alarms</u> <u>and Safety.</u>	Court Requirement 86, and Court Requirements 87, EC 1, 2, 4, 7, 8 and 10 are deleted. ²

SO ORDERED.

ELLEN BREE BURNS, SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this ____ day of December, 2005.

effectuating the Remedial Orders' desired results."). The parties responded with agreement to the court-ordered Remedial Plan which has been the guiding light toward purging Defendants' contempt.

² For clarity, it is noted that CR 87, EC 3, 5, 6 and 9, are retained.